REDMOND PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES

September 17, 2003

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chairperson Snodgrass, Commissioners Allen, Dunn, McCarthy, Parnell, Petitpas

STAFF PRESENT: Terry Marpert, Tom Barry, Gary Lee, Lori Peckol, Redmond Planning Department

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chair Snodgrass in the Public Safety Building Council Chambers. All members were present with the exception of Commissioner Bleuchel who was excused.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

It was agreed to add to the agenda approval of two sets of meeting minutes. The agenda was approved as amended.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

A. September 3, 2003
B. September 10, 2003

Both sets of minutes were approved as submitted.

ITEMS FROM THE AUDIENCE

PUBLIC HEARING AND STUDY SESSION

- Wellhead Protection Regulations, File: L030253

Chair Snodgrass declared the public hearing open.

Mr. Michael Johnson, 10716 SE 10th Street, spoke representing Redmond Industries for a Clean Environment (RICE), an industrial coalition working with the city to develop the ordinance. He began by saying that everyone working on the issue wants to protect groundwater and hopes the process undertaken will serve as a model of cooperation between the city, regulatory agencies and the business community. Throughout the process, progress was made by consensus; when consensus could not be reached, areas were identified for which the parties agreed to disagree. The consultant has done an excellent job of providing groundwater models to determine six-month, one-year, two-year and five-year times of travel for wellhead protection; collectively they are known as wellhead zones one through four. The city has asserted that the definition of the times of

travel zones is based on the best available science, and has held the best available science as the standard for all groundwater policy decisions. After the groundwater model was complete, the Natural Resources Division added a 1000-foot buffer to each of the wellhead protection zones in contrast with best available science. The implication is that the best available science on which all of the policies were based is not good enough to be trusted. Either the science is supportable or it is not. One of the unexpected consequences of the proposed ordinance is its effect on real estate values and transaction costs. Being located in a given wellhead protection zone can have profound effects on the desirability of an industrial property, and the costs of due diligence associated with leases, subleases and the like. Investigations have confirmed outstanding groundwater quality, but have also confirmed the best available science. Establishing a 1000-foot buffer will in many cases place facilities in incorrect wellhead protection zones. The buffer zone is a key area about which RICE and the city have agreed to disagree. The Planning Commission and the City Council should administer the policy fairly by amending the proposed ordinances and maps to eliminate the 1000-foot buffer. For the vast majority of facilities, the result will be a move only from Zone 1 to Zone 2, or from Zone 2 to Zone 3. Businesses would thus be compelled to comply with the measures best available science says are appropriate.

Chair Snodgrass asked Mr. Johnson if there are any particular provisions in the ordinance, other than the buffers, that trigger requirements of stricter due diligence. Mr. Johnson answered that for a property located in Zone 2 for which there is a real estate transaction pending, there must be a Phase I environmental investigation at a cost of between $20,000 and $30,000 for a large facility. Given the possibility of impact to a drinking water supply, the real estate transaction will also require a Phase II environmental investigation, which could involve wells or geo-probes, water and soil sampling, and much deeper investigation generally than would otherwise be required, all simply because under the proposed ordinance a property might arbitrarily be located in a time of travel zone.

Chair Snodgrass noted that a Phase II environmental investigation is looking for existing contaminants. He said he did not see where the ordinance imposes any more severe restrictions than exist under the federal regulations. Mr. Johnson noted that investors who are risk averse would rather purchase properties in a Zone 1 than Zone 4. The proposed ordinance creates the perception of intrinsic risk. Smaller constituents want to feel they are being regulated to a level appropriate to the risk they pose to the groundwater source, based on best available science.

Ms. Judy Jewell, 12120 - 202nd Avenue NE, Woodinville, spoke as president of Olympian Precast located at 192nd and Union Hill Road, and on behalf of RICE. She said the business community as represented by RICE wants the city to provide facility operators and owners the opportunity to upgrade critical systems, especially those systems protective of groundwater, that they otherwise would not be motivated to change. The proposed ordinance does not have the environmental improvement language proposed by RICE. She distributed to the Commissioners the language RICE would like to see included in the ordinance. She said the end goal of both the business community

and the city is to protect groundwater supplies. To that end, the proposed language encourages property owners to improve those elements of facilities which exist to protect water resources. Such systems are not currently updated because to do so can trigger expensive upgrades of adjacent structures, and can require removing existing facilities out of sensitive area buffers; that can impinge on other existing site operations. RICE does not want to see nonconformities expanded, or to escape compliance with current building and land use codes.

Chair Snodgrass asked Ms. Jewell to describe in lay language the proposed wording revisions. Ms. Jewell said the proposed ordinance leaves local business owners unable to upgrade facilities in ways that will protect groundwater. The ordinance has a number of triggers that limit what property owners can do based on the sensitive areas ordinance. There should be no prohibition against upgrading systems within the footprint of existing systems without triggering requirements to bring the entire site up to meet current requirements.

Mr. David Jennings, Wellhead Protection Manager for the Washington State Department of Health, Office of Drinking Water, PO Box 47849, Olympia, complemented the Commission on following the paths the state wanted to see followed when the wellhead protection program was started to protect groundwater-based drinking water supplies. The state program requires the water system to identify areas of recharge that provide the short-term sources of drinking water for communities, and use that information for making better decisions for protecting drinking water supplies. The purpose of wellhead protection is to focus prioritization of pollution prevention activities in and around drinking water supplies. There have been numerous instances around the country where drinking water supplies have unknowingly been contaminated leaving local jurisdictions to spend millions on cleanup activities and which have led consumers to question the safety of their drinking water. Western Washington is facing water shortages, making the ability to find new sources of supply more and more difficult. Existing sources of drinking water must be protected. Best available science is a fairly slippery slope. From the perspective of the state, it means having the best information possible upon which to make decisions. Ground water modeling can be done through a variety of formats, each using different data requirements. Depending on the situation, the cost can be very high. Even then, hydrogeologists cannot predict with any degree of certainty how the groundwater movement will occur. It is not at all unheard of to establish a 1000-foot buffer to deal with the uncertainties associated with groundwater flows. One of the concerns heard from the business community is focused on what impact the ordinance will have on real estate prices. Dayton, Ohio is a leading city when it comes to implementing wellhead protections. Some five years after the first ordinance was passed, a study was done to see what impact it had had on real estate values. The study concluded that in the wellhead protection areas the values rose higher relative to other parts of the community, in part because those areas became more attractive to businesses. Having strong drinking water protections is not necessarily bad for business.

Commissioner McCarthy asked if the mix of businesses in the wellhead protection areas of Dayton, Ohio increased or decreased the potential impact to the water supply. Ms.

Jennings said the city grandfathered in all existing businesses. Each was required to inventory their potential contaminant sources on site and were not allowed to increase the risk. As properties were sold or businesses changed, the risks were reduced even further. Commissioner McCarthy said under that scenario it would not be inconceivable to conclude that what had been industrial properties were converted to other commercial uses, such as retail, or residential.

Commissioner Dunn asked what it would take for a property owner who takes issue with his or her property being designated as being within a particular wellhead protection zone to make the case for redrawing the lines of the map. Mr. Jennings said it would take a review of the data used to generate the modeling and the map and perhaps collecting additional data. Modeling groundwater is not an exact science, and often the established boundaries are political rather than scientific.

Commissioner Petitpas asked if there is a range of buffer widths used by various jurisdictions. Mr. Jennings said the buffers are generally established based on specific geology and the rate of groundwater movement. Where the movement is greater, the buffer should be greater.

Mr. Tom Fix, 40307 SE 53rd Street, Snoqualmie, spoke as a Redmond employee responsible for drinking water quality and safety. He said that in order to fully appreciate Redmond's wells, it is necessary to concentrate on four specific points: uniqueness, cost savings, quality of water, and quantity of water. The city of Seattle has 28 purveyors that purchase water from them. Many of them are fully reliant on Seattle water for their drinking water. Redmond buys 60 percent of its water from Seattle; the remaining 40 percent is taken from the ground. The first city well in Redmond was drilled in 1951, and the city has six separate water rights. It would be very difficult to obtain additional water rights. It costs Redmond three times as much to purchase water from Seattle and deliver to Redmond customers as it does to produce the water from wells; over the years Redmond's wells have resulted in great savings for Redmond citizens. The quality of the water is unsurpassed; nothing has to be taken out of the water. Each of the three laboratories that test the water has remarked on the purity of the samples. The aquifer level in September 2003 is the same as it was in September 1962, and there is no reason to believe that in the future the water table will fall. The only mark against the city wells is that they are quite shallow and therefore vulnerable to contaminates. In the late 1980s the city's largest well became contaminated, and it took six months and 40,000 gallons of water to recover. In the mid-90s a contaminate used in the dry cleaning industry was detected in a couple of wells, though below health concern levels. There is everything to win by passing an effective wellhead protection plan.

Commissioner McCarthy asked how the statement of the state that water is becoming ever scarcer, against the statement that Redmond's water table has remained stable for more than 40 years. He also asked at what rate water would have to be pulled from the wells before a decrease in the water table could be noticed. Mr. Fix explained that the city has the right to remove only so much water. Water rights are granted in a manner to keep aquifers from being over pumped. The city is currently rebuilding its pumping

abilities in order to achieve 100 percent of the allowed water right. As areas that provide water to the underground aquifers are paved over, the aquifer levels will drop. That has occurred in some areas of the state. Additionally, if areas are contaminated, the water will be there but it will not be usable. Even in the Puget Sound region where there is a large amount of rainfall, the supply of aquifer water is limited.

Commissioner Petitpas asked why Redmond sells some of its water to unincorporated areas instead of using it to serve Redmond citizens, reducing the need to purchase water from Seattle. Mr. Fix allowed that during the summer months it is often not possible to produce all the water the residents want and need. In those instances, it is necessary to purchase water from outside sources. The Union Hill area has the same problem, and when they run low they purchase water from Redmond. By maximizing its water rights, Redmond will be able to be an even better neighbor than it already is.

Commissioner Parnell asked if during power outages the city is able to keep the water pumps running. Mr. Fix said only one city well is currently able to do that. As the wells are rebuilt, however, they will be set up to run from emergency generators. However, most homes in the city are fed by gravity flow, and the storage tanks hold a large supply to tide over during power outages.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Parnell, Mr. Fix said there is still much that is not known about reversing contamination of water supplies. In time some wells recover, while others never do. He said he is comfortable with the ordinance and hopes to see it implemented.

Ms. Susan Wilkins, 18024 NE 99th Court, said her interest in the passage of the ordinance has been directly influenced by her experiences growing up around businesses that use hazardous chemicals. She said she grew up in Ohio in an industrial town where cars and appliances were manufactured. For decades, many of the businesses were careless with the wastes they generated and the water in the city's wells began to taste and smell bad. The citizens were afraid to drink the water, and a variety of illnesses became common among many in the city. At that time many of the illnesses were fatal. The chemicals are dangerous to the health and the environment. While moving the city's water wells would be a good idea, it would also not be possible due to restrictions imposed by various Washington state agencies and the fact that the wells are located where the water is. Because the wells cannot be relocated, measures must be taken to protect the water in their current locations. Asking all businesses to fill out a hazardous material inventory statement and file any hazardous materials management plan, if necessary, is not an unreasonable requirement. The cost of compliance will be far less expensive than the cost of environmental cleanup. Any business that works with dangerous or poisonous chemicals must be closely monitored and held accountable. It cannot be assumed that businesses here today will be around tomorrow to clean up any hazardous situations they have created. She said that near her home town in Ohio most businesses closed down due to bankruptcy and overseas competition. The factory buildings are now empty or have been turned into vacant lots, but the chemicals are still around for the local and federal governments to clean up. No one who lives in Redmond should take the clean

environment for granted. Future generations deserve clean water. The wellhead protection ordinance should be passed for those future citizens and for all current citizens of Redmond who drink the water. The Snoqualmie valley is broad and flat, but the Bear Creek valley has a lot of sand and gravel deposits. The situation is unique and cannot be duplicated. Rainwater Phil's solo or valley and that provides the city of Redmond with its water. The city is lucky to have such a unique environment. Unfortunately the wells are down in the valley where contamination can occur. The proposed ordinance is necessary to protect the water sources.

Mr. Jon Spangler, Natural Resources Manager for the city of Redmond, and the city's representative on the Bear Creek Groundwater Protection Committee, read into the record a letter received from the King County groundwater protection policy analyst. The letter voiced support for the proposed wellhead protection regulations. The regulations provide a great step forward toward further protecting groundwater sources. The regulations follow through on several of the management strategies recommended by the Bear Creek Groundwater Management Plan. The Groundwater Protection Committee is responsible for monitoring and implementation of the plan and has been watching with great interest development of the proposal. The action indicates that the community is moving forward to achieve the groundwater protection identified in the plan. The significant efforts of the city to work with the local business community should be highlighted. The integration is a regional element to meeting state requirements for wellhead and critical aquifer recharge areas protection.

Chair Snodgrass asked what goes into the modeling studies for the establishment of the zones. Mr. Spangler allowed that the wellhead protection plan has many elements. The modeling looked at all potential contaminants throughout the city that could contaminate the aquifer. That report includes an inventory of what the potential contaminants are and where they are located strategically relative to the wells. There was a lot of modeling done to look at conditions of the aquifer, and the direction and speed of water flow relative to different times of the year. He said the additional 1000-foot buffer is necessary to provide the desired level of protection for the city's water supply. There are a lot of elements that are not accounted for in modeling, including vertical separation, topography and the like. The model in itself is very sophisticated, but there are many variables. The additional buffer area is necessary to provide adequate protections.

Chair Snodgrass asked if it would be safe to say that the modeling produces a predictable outcome, something at the top of the bell curve of options from safe to unsafe, and that the modeling will not produce a line beyond which things are safe or unsafe. Mr. Spangler said the modeling gives the best available information. He allowed that the best available science is never absolute; beyond that, best professional judgment must be used to ensure protections. The additional 1000-foot buffer cannot be considered arbitrary or capricious. It is necessary to protect the water resource, and to impose an inadequate buffer would be to open the resource to degradation.

Commissioner McCarthy asked how much time the 1000-foot buffer represents. Mr. Spangler said that time is variable based on conditions. Much depends on the distance to

the wellhead itself. Commissioner McCarthy said in the context of the discussion the 1000 feet should represent more than just distance. Mr. Spangler said it is a time factor and is variable by area. The additional buffer is intended to take into account those elements that are variable and which affect the aquifer, but not to the degree the significant parameters do.

Commissioner Allen asked how the 1000-foot number was chosen over 750 feet or some other number. Mr. Spangler said the number came from the recommendations offered by the consultant. He noted that the consultant was present in the audience and could probably answer the question.

Natural Resources Planner Tom Barry said the 1000-foot buffer is more of a safety zone than a buffer; it is more of a true wellhead protection zone. The information the model spits out refers to capture zones. The capture zones are generated based on the limited information that can be put into the model. Once the capture zones are identified, additional factors are taken into account, such as is zoning, risks, and information regarding potentially dangerous hazardous materials and waste contaminated and potentially contaminated sites. Other considerations include streams as they cross boundaries, and systems that are very near the boundaries. Drainage patterns, zones of higher protection, and topography are also considered in addition to the capture zones. In Redmond, the average travel rate of water through the soil is eight feet per day. Factoring that rate into a 1000-foot buffer yields approximately 125 days of additional protection. The closer to the well, the shorter the time because the well has more influence on the actual rates by which potential contaminants can be pulled in.

Mr. Mike Warfel, a geologic engineering consultant with Parametrics, said he has been involved in the project since it started in 1994. He said the modeling work was done under the guidance of the state's wellhead protection documentation. The documentation indicates which methods for calculating the capture zones are recommended based on the number of connections in the system, how complicated the geology is, and how shallow the wells are. Because the geology in Redmond is somewhat complicated, the modeling required a more sophisticated technique. The result was more irregularly shaped cones of depression reflected in the capture zones. The capture zones are the output of the model.

Continuing, Mr. Warfel said the next step is to figure out what to do with the information. Administratively it usually does not make sense to just use the lines from the model as the wellhead protection zones. Where there are wells somewhat close to each other, the results are nicely delineated capture zones. Often in the middle of those zones will be areas that are just blank. During the interpretive process it must be determined whether or not those areas should remain blank or if the wellhead protection zone should be expanded to include those areas. If left blank, it is conceivable that a concentration of chemicals could be stored in those areas. Those kinds of interpretive and judgment calls are used to come up with the wellhead protection zones.

Commissioner Parnell asked who developed the actual capture zone model that Redmond uses, and asked if there are differing models. Mr. Warfel said there is a section in the

wellhead protection report that talks about how the modeling approach was selected. The model chosen for Redmond is not a three dimensional, complicated model that costs thousands of dollars to run; that would not be practical. The model was fairly simple to run and it fit the geology of Redmond. The results that the modeling yielded were acceptable for the best available science guidance. All models have limitations; there is no practical way to include effects from all streams.

Commissioner Dunn asked if the model predicts variability and standard deviations. Mr. Warfel allowed that it does not. He said there are other models that are probabilistic. Commissioner Dunn asked if the more sophisticated models return a percent variance that is standard or that typically occurs. Mr. Warfel said it is dangerous to look at numbers that loosely. Groundwater monitoring is not an exact science; the best that can be done is an approximation. Even with the most expensive models, there are always deviations from what is actually occurring in the geology. The models all assume that the ground is homogenous and isotropic, which means there is no layering at all. It is known, however, that when the sediments were laid down there was layering.

Commissioner McCarthy asked if it would be fair to say that for some of the wells in Redmond, the 1000-foot buffer is immaterial given the immediate geology. Mr. Warfel allowed that could be said, but added that a decision would then have to be made about where that would be true and where it would not be true. It is also possible that an area where water is flowing freely into the well could be located just a few feet away from where water will take greater than ten years to flow into the well. The issue is the degree of certainty. Buffers are generally widely drawn for the very reason of taking into account such anomalies.

Commissioner Allen asked Mr. Warfel if he was comfortable in stating that the 1000-foot buffer is consistent with best available science. He answered by saying the best available science was used to develop the capture zone lines. He said he had no opinion on specific buffer distances, adding that 1000 feet is a very protective distance.

Given that a 1000-foot buffer offers on average 120 days of protection, Commissioner Allen asked if 120 days is a reasonable time in which to intervene in the case of an incident. Mr. Warfel said the purpose of wellhead protection ordinances is prevention, not intervention. Once contaminants are in the soil, there is a problem, and once the contaminants go from soil to ground water the problem is intensified and cannot be cleaned up easily. The practice of flushing aquifers is very costly and has not been shown to be successful. The issue is less focused on the amount of time to respond to incidents and more focused on proactively protecting the wells. Anyone handling dangerous chemicals must take prudent measures to keep them from getting into the ground in the first place.

Mr. Johnson said it is no accident that Redmond's groundwater is pristine. Everyone is sensitive to the fact that the water supply is valuable to the community. The 1000-foot, 120-day buffer is valid so long as the water is traveling in a straight line toward the well. However, it is possible that by being cross-gradient to the well the travel time within the

buffer could be infinite. Genie Industries is shown as being located within Zone 1 because within 800 feet of the property is the edge of the six-month time of travel zone. Ten feet past that is the one-year time of travel zone, ten feet past that is the five-year time of travel zone, and ten feet beyond that is the ten-year time of travel zone. The closer to the wellhead, the less the travel time relative to the well. The size of the buffer may be more relevant up-gradient from a well. Many Redmond businesses are located near the wells; many of them are down-gradient from the wells. It may be that everyone should sit down and look at a different algorithm. One option would be to look at time of travel plus 50 percent. The businesses in Redmond simply want to be regulated in a fair and scientifically based way.

Commissioner Parnell asked if there is any way to know for sure how long it takes for a substance to move through the ground and into a well. Mr. Johnson said if such a test were to be conducted, the results would be appropriate only for the time the testing is done. Conditions change over time. The hydrology of all the systems are constantly interacting.

Ms. Chris Colt, 19915 NE Redmond Road, said she lives in unincorporated King County but receives her water from Redmond's well number three. She said that purity of the water is of great concern. She said she would support the most stringent requirements to give the city the tools necessary to protect the water. The ordinance should not be overly onerous. Businesses already must keep track of off-site chemicals for various governmental entities; that information should be made available to the city. As Toxic Release Program Inventory Manager for the Environmental Protection Agency, she noted that often the federal requirements have thresholds higher than what is needed to protect groundwater. She provided the Commissioners with a list of all facilities in Redmond that must report under the Emergency Planning Community Right-to-Know Act, a program that has been around since 1986. There are financial benefits for accurately tracking chemicals; businesses are able to determine ways to use less of such products.

Commissioner Parnell said he did not see on the list of facilities the gas station located across from Anderson Park. Ms. Colt allowed that federal laws are less stringent than local laws. Federal law limits the facilities to manufacturing and certain other industries. Service industries, which includes gasoline service stations, are not covered.

Mr. Barry noted from the materials that some businesses showed releases of as much as 7000 pounds. Ms. Colt said the Toxic Release Inventory Program requires reporting of all releases, some of which are permitted and some of which are not.

Chair Snodgrass declared the public hearing open for written comments, and declared the spoken portion closed.

BREAK

STUDY SESSION

- 2003-2004 Comprehensive Plan Update, Downtown Chapter

Referring to the staff memo, Commissioner Allen noted that most of the zoning capacity for residential development is in the downtown and in Overlake. She asked how the percentages break down. Lori Peckol, Principal Planner, said she would get back to the Commission how the initial assumptions play out by neighborhood.

Commissioner Allen asked if statistics are available regarding neighborhood infill capacity. Ms. Peckol said staff has the numbers but cautioned that they do not reflect innovative housing types such as accessory dwelling units and cottage housing.

Chair Snodgrass asked if staff has reviewed the vision and framework policies that were recently adopted and put them into the policies currently under review. Ms. Peckol said that work is just beginning. Mr. Lee added that the framework policies provide overarching principles and are spelled out in a separate chapter. The downtown and housing chapters are separate and more detailed.

Commissioner Dunn stressed the need to establish the process clearly before proceeding. She noted that staff is getting input from different directions and asked when the Commission will be able to provide its input. Mr. Lee said the study session was intended to bring the Commission up to speed on the chapter and to generate comment from the Commission. He proposed starting with the existing Comprehensive Plan policies.

Commissioner Dunn proposed that the issues shown on the list provide a good start: Perrigo Plat, the Riverwalk, and the rezones proposed to encourage residential development. She said it may be necessary to address height restrictions for each of the areas, business caps on gross leasable area, transfer of development rights, policies that overlap with transportation and natural character, and simplifying the downtown plan and giving it more structural organization. She said she was not anticipating reviewing each individual policy in the downtown plan, but organizing the policies in a more logical fashion.

Ms. Peckol said transfer of development rights is on the work plan for overall evaluation and will be coming before the Commission in time. She said there are two elements to each of the chapter updates. The first is identifying and addressing the big picture of policy questions, and the second is updating each chapter to be consistent with the format of the framework policies.

Mr. Lee stressed the need to review all of the existing policies and to provide direction regarding issues that should be included but are not. The basic document should be used as a starting point. Ms. Peckol noted that over time there has been a lot of public process involved in developing the downtown plan. For that reason, it will be vital to gain an understanding of what the current plan is all about and the intent for the different

districts. There will be some major reformatting involved, but the primary issue will be the major policy questions related to the growth update.

Commissioner Parnell said he was particularly interested in addressing accessibility and public safety for the school and community center near Perrigo Plat.

Chair Snodgrass proposed addressing each design district individually. He allowed that the general policies are already in place. That approach will allow the framework policies to be applied district by district. At the next meeting there should be a fifteen- or twenty-minute summary of the existing vision for the downtown, and a general idea of what changes staff believe are necessary, followed by Planning Commission discussion of changes they believe should be considered.

REPORTS

Chair Snodgrass introduced to the public the new Commissioner, Korby Parnell.

Ms. Peckol reported that the City Council at its meeting on September 16 adopted the vision, goals and framework policies. There were a few revisions made, including increasing the emphasis on education and citizen involvement programs as part of protecting the natural environment; a series of refinements to the vision and the clarifying of some of the policies; and adding in the concept of promoting ethnic diversity as part of the vision statement.

Terry Marpert, principal planner, provided the Commissioners with a document describing the sounding board process for the SR-520 bridge study. He noted that there will be outreach to the Eastside as well as to Seattle on the part of the Washington State Department of Transportation. They are seeking four to five people from Redmond to represent the city on the Eastside sounding board. He said the anticipation is that over the next two years there will be some four meetings of about three hours each. The names of those who volunteer will be forwarded to the City Council.

It was moved and seconded to extend the meeting beyond 10:00 p.m.; the motion carried unanimously.

SCHEDULING/TOPICS FOR NEXT MEETING(S)

Staff reviewed with the Commissioners topics for upcoming meetings.

ADJOURN

Chair Snodgrass adjourned the meeting at 10:03 p.m.

Minutes Approved On: Recording Secretary: